

Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

mention notice, but it is perhaps necessary. *Southern Flour Co.* v. *St. Louis Grain Co.* (Ga. 1912), 75 S. E. 439. The Sales Act stipulates that notice shall be unnecessary.

SALES—MONOPOLIES—LIABILITY OF BUYER FOR PURCHASE PRICE.—Plaintiff, who for purposes of the decision may be considered a combination in unlawful restraint of trade, sold glucose to the defendants for its own consumption only and not for resale, and agreed in return for the exclusive trade of the defendant for any one year to give a rebate on the exclusive trade of the year next preceding. In an action for the price the defendant set up the above facts and claimed that the contract of sale with its provisions against resale and for a rebate formed part of a conspiracy in restraint of trade, void under the Sherman Anti-Trust law. *Held,* that the contract was merely collateral to the restraint of trade, and that the defendant was liable for the contract price. *Wilder Mfg. Co.* v. *Corn Products etc. Co.* (Ga. 1912), 75 S. E. 918.

It is no defense to an action for the price that the seller is a combination in restraint of trade, under either the common law or the Sherman Anti-Trust law. *Connelly* v. *Sewer Pipe Co.,* 184 U. S. 540; *Charles E. Wiswall Co.* v. *Scott,* 86 Fed. 671; *Bessire & Co.* v. *Corn Producers Mfg. Co.* (Ind. 1911), 94 N. E. 353. But if the contract of sale is such that the buyer becomes a part of the combination or conspiracy in restraint of trade, he is not liable for the price. *Continental Wall Paper Co.* v. *Voight,* 212 U. S. 227.

SUNDAY STATUTES—WORK OF NECESSITY.—Defendants were prosecuted for violation of a Sunday statute, which forbade work or labor on Sunday, and which excepted from its operation works of necessity or charity. The petition alleged that the defendants kept their place of business open on Sunday, and sold bread, butter, sandwiches, coffee and chocolate therein on that day. *Held* that a general demurrer to the petition was properly sustained; that as a matter of law, the sale of the articles enumerated was a work of necessity. *Commonwealth* v. *London* (Ky. 1912), 149 S. W. 852.

"The question of what is and what is not a labor of necessity within the Sunday statutes has been often mooted and much discussed in the authorities." *State* v. *Schatt,* 128 Mo. App. 622. That there should be some difference of opinion is nearly inevitable from the very nature of these statutes. As was said in *State* v. *James,* 81 S. C. 197, "Necessity is an elastic term. It does not mean that which is indispensable, but it means something more than that which is merely needful or desirable." The basis of the Court's decision in the principal case was that the defendants, in disposing of the articles named, were doing the business of a restaurant keeper. It has been generally held that innkeepers and restaurant keepers are performing works of necessity in the conduct of their business, and hence are not within the prohibition of the statutes. *Com.* v. *Naylor,* 34 Pa. St. 86; *Com.* v. *Hengler,* 15 Pa. Co. Ct. 222. The preparation of food in the household by a servant is a work of necessity. *Crosman* v. *City of Lynn,* 121 Mass. 301. But in *Com.* v. *Crowley,* 145 Mass. 430, it was held that the sale of bread, pastry, and milk from a shop on Sunday was unlawful, and that an excep-